RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 18 2007

REMARKS

The Applicants would like to thank Examiner Sanders for discussing the instant Office Action with Applicants' attorney, as well as for her helpful suggestions in order to respond to the instant Office Action.

Claims 1-11, 17 and 18, which were subjected to the Restriction requirement have now been cancelled.

Claims 12-16, 19 and 20, and new Claims 21-33, remain pending in the above-identified application. Applicants have amended Claims 12-16, 19 and 20, and this amendment is not intended to overcome any application of prior art and nor is it intended to limit the scope of the claim in any manner. Support for the new Claims 21-33, can be found in the original Claims 8 and 9, 17 and 18, 11, 12-16, 21, 22, 19, 20, and 23, respectively. Additional support for the new independent Claim 24, appears in the specification, such as, paragraphs 0014 and 0015. No new matter has been added. In view of the above amendment and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable.

The Rejection of Claims 12-16, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn

Claims 12-16, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Applicants have amended Claim 12, as suggested by the Examiner, and therefore Claim 12, is now patentable. Additionally, Claims 13-16, 19 and 20, depend from, and include all the limitations of Claim 12, and therefore are also now all patentable.

Therefore, the Examiner is kindly requested to withdraw her rejection of Claims 12-16, 19 and 20, under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The Rejection of Claims 12-16, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn

Claims 12-16, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Patent Office has contended that these claims are unpatentable over Fukushi (U.S. Patent No. 6,759,129) (hereinafter Fukushi) in view of Yamamoto (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0,129,383) (hereinafter Yamamoto).

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 12-16, 19 and 20, are not unpatentable over Fukushi in view of Yamamoto for at least the following reasons.

In order for a claim to be rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), not only must the prior art teach or suggest each element of the claim, the prior art must also suggest combining the elements in the manner contemplated by the claim. See Northern Telecom, Inc. v. Datapoint Corp., 908 F. 2d 931, 934 (Fed. Cir. 1990), cert. denied 111 S.Ct. 296 (1990); In re Bond, 910 F. 2d 831, 834 (Fed. Cir. 1990). The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. See M.P.E.P. §2142 To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must show, *inter alia*, that there is some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify or combine the references and that, when so modified or combined, the prior art teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations. See M.P.E.P. § 2143. Applicants respectfully submit that neither of these criteria for obviousness are met here.

Applicants have amended Claims 12-16, 19 and 20, and therefor the rejection of these claims under Fukushi in view of Yamamoto is now moot.

Fukushi (U.S. Patent No. 6,759,129) (hereinafter Fukushi) was discussed in the specification in paragraph [0007] by the Applicants and that discussion with reference to Fukushi is incorporated herein by reference.

Yamamoto (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0,129,383) (hereinafter Yamamoto) discloses a liquid thermosetting resin composition, printed wiring boards and process for their production.

The Applicants would like to respectfully state that Fukushi in view of Yamamoto does not overcome the deficiencies of the prior art, for example Fukushi in view of Yamamoto does not teach the placement of "a substrate in a mold, and wherein said substrate alone is first pre-cured to an incomplete state of cure in said mold at a temperature of 75 to 125 C." and that "an uncured fluoroelastomer layer of less than or

equal to 0.3 mm thickness is placed on said pre-cured substrate" and that "said layers are cured together in said mold at a temperature of 150 to 225 C to form an intermediate article," as disclosed and claimed by the Applicants in Claims 12-16, 19 and 20.

In fact, Fukushi teaches away from Applicants' invention when in column 2, line 62, to column 3, line 8, he teaches that "Adhesion between a fluoropolymer and a substrate is improved" by providing "a bonding layer including a fluoroelastomer or fluoroelastomer solution."

Furthermore, in column 2, line 67, to column 3, line 4, Fukushi teaches that a "multi-layer article 2 includes fluoropolymer 10 contacting bonding layer 11, which in turn contacts substrate 12", and that the "bonding layer 11 can be a fluoroelastomer solution coated onto either the substrate 12 or fluoropolymer layer 10." This is very different than what is being disclosed and claimed by the Applicants.

Fukushi also teaches away from Applicants' invention when in column 3, lines 4-8, he teaches that after "removing solvent from the bonding layer 11, the fluoroelastomer coated substrate 12 or fluoropolymer layer 10 can be covered by or laminated with the other of fluoropolymer layer 10 or substrate 12 to form multi-layer article 2", which is again very different than what is being disclosed and claimed by the Applicants.

Yamamoto also teaches away from Applicants' invention when in paragraph 0069, lines 1-2, he teaches that the substrate 1, is laminated with a copper foil 2, while the Applicants teach and disclose that a thin uncured fluoroelastomer film or layer of 0.3 mm or less is placed on the substrate 2, and the Examiner has not shown these two processes and materials to be equivalent or the same.

Additionally, there is no teaching in Yamamoto that the substrate 1, be coated with a thin uncured fluoroelastomer film or layer of 0.3 mm or less, as disclosed and claimed by the Applicants in Claims 12-16, 19 and 20.

In light of these facts Applicants respectfully submit that Fukushi in view of Yamamoto does not make unpatentable the invention of independent Claim 12.

Claims 13-16, 19 and 20, depend from, and include all the limitations of Claim 12, and therefor these claims are not unpatentable over Fukushi in view of Yamamoto.

For at least the reasons discussed above, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) with respect to Claims 12-16, 19 and 20, is hereby respectfully requested.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 18 2007

CONCLUSION:

It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 12-16, 19 and 20, as amended, and new Claims 21-33, are now all allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

The Applicants have reviewed the cited but unapplied art and cannot respond as the Examiner has not applied said prior art.

The Examiner is also invited to contact the undersigned attorney if any communication is believed to be helpful in advancing the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 18, 2007

By: Aziz M. Ahsan

Aziz M. Ahsan
Reg. No. 32,100

USPTO Customer Number 33217
P. O. Box 251
Hopewell Junction, New York 12533-0251

845-790-0198 – Telephone
845-226-4765 – Facsimile